

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-34 are pending. Claims 17-34 are amended. Claims 1-16 were canceled previously. Support for the amendments to Claims 17-34 is self-evident inasmuch as these claims are amended to clarify existing terms within the claims themselves. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 17-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claims 17-28, 32, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Caimi (U.S. Patent No. 4,664,690). Claims 29-31 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Caimi in view of Okamoto (U.S. Patent No. 4,608,777).

At the outset, Applicant notes with appreciation the courtesy of a personal interview granted by Examiner Catherine Kelly and Supervisory Patent Examiner Katherine Mitchell to Applicant's representative. In combination with the interview summary provided by Examiner Kelly, the substance of the personal interview is substantially summarized below in accordance with MPEP §713.04.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 17-32 as indefinite, the term "coaxially" in independent Claim 17 has been replaced with "transversely" as discussed during the personal interview. Thus, the term used in amended independent Claim 17 is clearly different than the term "longitudinally." Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 17 and the claims depending therefrom as indefinite is overcome.

All of the pending claims are amended as discussed during the personal interview in order to further clarify the features of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 17-32 as indefinite is overcome.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 17-28, 32 and 33 as obvious over Caimi, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response.

As discussed above and during the personal interview, the term “coaxially” in independent Claim 17 is replaced with “transversely.” Thus, Claim 17 recites that the cam guide includes grooves into each of which a roller of said first carriages engages. The roller is moved forward longitudinally and transversely with respect to the rail. Before Claim 17 was amended, the outstanding Office Action interpreted Claim 17 to recite that the roller was movable longitudinally and did not require transverse movement. However, as discussed during the personal interview and as is evident from amended Claim 17, the roller is movable both longitudinally and transversely in amended independent Claim 17. As discussed during the personal interview, Caimi fails to disclose the above-noted feature. Claims 32 and 33 recite substantially similar features to those discussed above regarding Claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 17, the claims depending therefrom, and Claims 32-33 patentably distinguish over Caimi for at least the reasons discussed above.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 29-31 and 34 as obvious over Caimi in view of Okamoto, Applicant respectfully submits that no reasonable combination of Caimi and Okamoto would include all of the features recited in amended independent Claim 17 or Claims 29-31 depending therefrom. Claim 34 recites substantially similar features to those discussed above regarding Claim 17 and patentably distinguishes any reasonable combination of the cited references for at the same reasons amended Claim 17 does.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Lee L. Stepina
Registration No. 56,837